



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,688	05/14/2007	Kazunori Kaneda	Q96967	9004
23373	7590	12/06/2010	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			FISCHER, JUSTIN R	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1747	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/06/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com  
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM  
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

**Continuation of 7:** The claims are rejected in the same manner as set forth in the Final Rejection mailed on August 26, 2010.

**Continuation of 10:** The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed November 23, 2010 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, and 11 based upon Hahn as set forth in the last Office action because: the reference expressly teaches the use of resorcin (resorcinol). It is agreed that the reference suggests additional diols, such as hydroquinone; however, there is no picking and choosing when it comes to the diol since the primary reference (Hahn) expressly teaches a wire coat rubber composition including a polyester formed with resorcin. It is further noted that applicant's results and the original disclosure suggest that hydroquinone is a preferred embodiment and resorcinol is a most preferred embodiment. Thus, the declaration fails to provide a conclusive showing of unexpected results to establish a criticality for the claimed rubber composition.

**Continuation of 11:** Applicant argues that Hahn is directed to a high modulus rubber composition and fails to disclose or suggest improved adhesion between a coating rubber and a steel cord. However, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). It is emphasized that the rubber composition of Hahn expressly includes a polyester formed by reacting a

diacid chloride with resorcin and such is consistent with the claimed rubber composition.

Lastly, applicant's arguments with respect to the declaration have been addressed above.

/Justin R Fischer/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1747

November 29, 2010